t

mdnrstrated. In the examination of the fifith, we shall confute the Anaximandrian Atheism there propounded, which is, as it were, the first sciogra-phy and rude delineation of Atheism. And in-the confutation of the sixth, we shall shew, bow the ancient Atomic Atheists did preventively overthrow the foundation of Hylozoism. Besides all: which, in order to afuller and more thorough confutation, both of the Cosmo-plastic and Hylozoic Atheisms, we shall iu this very place take occa-siojn to insist largely upon the plastic life of nature, giving in the first place a true account of it; and then afterwards shewing, how grossly it is misunderstood, and the pretence of.it abused, by the as-sertbrs of both these Atheistic hypotheses. The beads of which larger digression, because they could riot be so conveniently inserted in the contents of the chapter, shall be represented to the reader's view at the end of it.

xxxvu. For we think fit here to observe, that neither the Cosmo-plastic or Stoical, nor the Hy-^ iozoic or Stratonical Atheists, are therefore condemned by us, because they suppose such a thing as a plastic nature, or life distinct from theamMall; albeit this be not only exploded, as an absolute nonentity, by the Atomic Atheists, who might possibly be afraid of it, as that which approached too near to a Deity, or else would hazard the introducing of it; but also utterly discarded by some professed Theists of later times, who might notwithstanding have an tindiscerned tang of the Me-chinic Atheism hanging about them, in that their so confident rejecting of all final a»d intending causality in nature, and admitting of no other causes of thingvS, as philosophical, save the mate-